

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-18, 20-27 and 29-33 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 10, 18 and 26 have been amended. Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Furthermore, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

A. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-8, 20-27, 39-33 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112, 2ND PARAGRAPH

The Office asserts that claims 1-8, 20-27, 39-33 are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Office asserts that “the claims preamble recites “...validating remotely cached content...”; the body of claims only includes the steps of determining, generating, returning...but not actual validating of the cache content that is recited in the preamble. Office Action, p. 2. Applicant submits that validating the cached response, *inter alia*, provides validation of the cache content recited in the preamble. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office further states that “the claims are incomplete (e.g. the claims do not show what steps would be taken, if it is determined that cache content is invalid).” Office Action, p. 2. Applicants state that as the preamble sets forth, claims 1, 10, 18 and 26 are directed to validating cached content. Claims 3, 12, 21, 29 are directed to the situation when the cached content is invalid. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

B. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-18, 20-27 and 29-33 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

In the Office Action, claims 1-18, 20-27 and 29-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0026563 A1 to Chamberlain et al., herein after “Chamberlain,” in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0105838 A1 to Presley and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0182357 A1 to Chess et al., hereinafter “Chess.” Office Action, p. 3. With regard to the rejection, Applicant asserts that the cited references fail to teach each and every feature of the claimed invention.

For example, with respect to independent claims 1, 10, 18 and 26, Applicant submits that the cited references fail to teach “analyzing a plurality of parts of a response to a client request to identify a plurality of attributes thereof, wherein the attributes identify a set of dependencies of the content on sources of dynamic content.” Neither Chamberlain, Chess nor Presley disclose this analysis to identify a set of dependencies, upon which an entity tag is based (as discussed below). As a result, Applicant respectfully submit that the Office has failed to state a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to independent claims 1, 10, 18 and 26 and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Applicants further submit that the cited references fail to teach “generating an entity tag based on the cacheability, the sources and the set of dependencies, wherein the entity tag identifies the sources and includes cacheability flags and time values associated with the set of dependencies.” In the Office Action, the Office asserts that the XML doclet tags of Presley are equivalent to the Applicant’s entity tags. Office Action, p. 4. However, the caching strategy flags disclosed by Presley fail to identify the sources of dynamic content. Instead, the XML doclet flags of Presley simply provide a version number and date to allow multiple versions of

the doclet to be maintained. Although these XML tags allow load resources to be defined, these tags are not equivalent to an entity tag that, *inter alia*, identifies sources of dynamic web content. The entity tag of the claimed invention is generated for the response that is based on the sources of content, as well as any dependencies of the response on those sources. Specifically, the entity tag identifies the sources of dynamic content in the response. Applicant submits that Presley, nor Chamberlain or Chess, disclose this claimed feature. As a result, Applicant respectfully submit that the Office has failed to state a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to independent claims 1, 10, 18 and 26 and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Applicants further submit that the cited references fail to disclose or teach comparing the time values for the sources without evaluating or rebuilding the response. In contrast, the claimed invention allows dynamic content to be validated without having to evaluate the web page. Specifically, the claimed invention analyzes the entity tag (as discussed above) instead of re-evaluating or rebuilding the web page. As a result, Applicant respectfully submit that the Office has failed to state a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to independent claims 1, 10, 18 and 26 and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

With respect to dependent claims 2-5, 7-9, 11-17, 20-25, 27 and 29-33, Applicant herein incorporates the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on the above arguments, as well as for their own additional features.

IV. CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter.

Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Meghan Q. Toner/

Meghan Q. Toner

Rcg. No. 52,142

Date: October 9, 2007

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)